



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/633,004	07/31/2003	Inderjit Singh	NVIDP234/P000825	8949
28875	7590	07/21/2005		EXAMINER
Zilka-Kotab, PC P.O. BOX 721120 SAN JOSE, CA 95172-1120			VU, HUNG K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2811	

DATE MAILED: 07/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

**Application No.**

10/633,004

**Applicant(s)**

SINGH ET AL.

**Examiner**

Hung Vu

**Art Unit**

2811

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 27 June 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-18, 20, 21 and 27-31.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 19 and 22-26.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Attachment.

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 11/12/03, 06/27/05

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Hung Vu

Hung Vu  
Primary Examiner

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Newly proposed independent claim 1 by incorporating the limitations of claims 28 and 31 which are separately depend on claim 1 into claim 1, and extensive amendments to claims 20 and 21 raise new issues of the remaining claims that would require further consideration and/or search.

**Notice of Non-Compliant  
Amendment (37 CFR 1.121)**

Application No.

10/633,004

Applicant(s)

SINGH ET AL.

Examiner

Art Unit

Hung Vu

2811

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

The amendment document filed on 27 June 2005 is considered non-compliant because it has failed to meet the requirements of 37 CFR 1.121. In order for the amendment document to be compliant, correction of the following item(s) is required.

THE FOLLOWING MARKED (X) ITEM(S) CAUSE THE AMENDMENT DOCUMENT TO BE NON-COMPLIANT:

1. Amendments to the specification:

- A. Amended paragraph(s) do not include markings.
- B. New paragraph(s) should not be underlined.
- C. Other \_\_\_\_\_

2. Abstract:

- A. Not presented on a separate sheet. 37 CFR 1.72.
- B. Other \_\_\_\_\_

3. Amendments to the drawings:

- A. The drawings are not properly identified in the top margin as "Replacement Sheet," "New Sheet," or "Annotated Sheet" as required by 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- B. The practice of submitting proposed drawing correction has been eliminated. Replacement drawings showing amended figures, without markings, in compliance with 37 CFR 1.84 are required.
- C. Other \_\_\_\_\_

4. Amendments to the claims:

- A. A complete listing of all of the claims is not present.
- B. The listing of claims does not include the text of all pending claims (including withdrawn claims)
- C. Each claim has not been provided with the proper status identifier, and as such, the individual status of each claim cannot be identified. Note: the status of every claim must be indicated after its claim number by using one of the following status identifiers: (Original), (Currently amended), (Cancelled), (Previously presented), (New), (Not entered), (Withdrawn) and (Withdrawn-currently amended).
- D. The claims of this amendment paper have not been presented in ascending numerical order.
- E. Other: \_\_\_\_\_

For further explanation of the amendment format required by 37 CFR 1.121, see MPEP § 714 and the USPTO website at <http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/ropa/preognitice/officeflyer.pdf>.

TIME PERIODS FOR FILING A REPLY TO THIS NOTICE:

1. Applicant is given no new time period if the non-compliant amendment is an after-final amendment or an amendment filed after allowance. If applicant wishes to resubmit the non-compliant after-final amendment with corrections, the entire corrected amendment must be resubmitted within the time period set forth in the final Office action.
2. Applicant is given one month, or thirty (30) days, whichever is longer, from the mail date of this notice to supply the corrected section of the non-compliant amendment in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121, if the non-compliant amendment is one of the following: a preliminary amendment, a non-final amendment (including a submission for a request for continued examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114), a supplemental amendment filed within a suspension period under 37 CFR 1.103(a) or (c), and an amendment filed in response to a Quayle action.

Extensions of time are available under 37 CFR 1.136(a) only if the non-compliant amendment is a non-final amendment or an amendment filed in response to a Quayle action.

Failure to timely respond to this notice will result in:

Abandonment of the application if the non-compliant amendment is a non-final amendment or an amendment filed in response to a Quayle action; or

Non-entry of the amendment if the non-compliant amendment is a preliminary amendment or supplemental amendment.

*Hung Vu*  
HUNG VU  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Part of Paper No. 072005

***Response to Arguments***

Continuation of 11.

It is argued that any attempt to position the metal layer of TAnaka, at least partially, directly above the active circuit would render an unworkable device as the design of Tanaka is simply not equipped to meet such design, for example, the deficient number of layers to accomplish the same in Tanaka. This argument is not convincing because Tanaka discloses the structure with the multilayer interconnections. Further, in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

It is argued that Tanaka merely recognizes the problem of bond density, disconnection, etc., but does not disclose the mess ensures that bonds are capable of being placed over the active circuit without damage. This argument is not convincing because Tanaka discloses the method of forming the mess to prevent the crack formed in the insulating interlayer, therefore, it is inherent that the mess ensures that bonds are capable of being placed over the active circuit without damage.

It is argued that Figure 6A of Tanaka does not disclose at least two spaced rows for each of the first portions and a width of the first portions is enlarged to accommodate the at least two spaced rows of each of the first portions. This argument is not convincing because Figure 6A

shows one bonding pad which corresponds to the first portion, and Figure 11 shows a plurality of bonding pads which correspond to a plurality of first portions.

It is argued that Applicant's Admitted Prior Art of Figures 1 – 2 do not disclose a plurality of metal layers positioned under the active circuit, but are side-by-side. This argument is not convincing because Applicant's Admitted Prior Art of Figures 1 – 2, disclose a plurality of metal layers (M1 – M4) positioned under the active circuit. Note that the claimed language does not specifically state whether the plurality of metal layers are directly under the active circuit.